



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,061	02/05/2001	Nicholas J. Elsey	41698-1005	2496
7590	01/12/2005		EXAMINER	
Alex L. Yip Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays & Handler, LLP 425 Park Avenue New York, NY 10022			CHOW, MING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/777,061	ELSEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit Ming Chow

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 43-52 and 88-97 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 43-50,52,88-95 and 97 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 51 and 96 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 51, 96 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not teach a statistics report for communications based on selected one or more records. And, the records represent a plurality of events occurring during a communication.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 43, 45-50, 52, 88, 90-95, 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjornberg et al (US: 6647111), and in view of Lew et al (US: 6483898).

Regarding claims 43, 45, 88, 90, Bjornberg et al teach on column 5 line 42-52, a central process (claimed “an interface”) collects multiple event records (claimed “plurality of events”)

during a call (claimed “during the communication”). A report server (claimed “a processor”) collects all event information and summarizes a report (claimed “an output”).

Bjornberg et al failed to teach “identifier”. However, Lew et al teach on column 5 line 35-39, event record having identifiers identifying the communication by calling party number, called party number.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Bjornberg et al to have the “identifier” as taught by Lew et al such that the modified system of Bjornberg et al would be able to support the system users with ease of associating event records by identifiers.

Regarding claims 46, 47, 91, 92, the statistics report as taught by Bjornberg et al is for a call. Therefore, the statistics report is a function of time from the call begins until the call terminates.

Regarding claims 48, 49, 50, 93, 94, 95, 97, the NGSN as taught by Bjornberg et al reads on claimed “call center” and “carrier” and “market”. The statistics report generated by the NGSN and therefore the statistics report is a function of the NGSN, the carrier, and the market.

Regarding claim 52, the modified system of Bjornberg et al in view of Lew et al as stated in claim 43 above failed to teach “the data includes indications of selected events represented by the selected records”. However, Lew et al teach on column 5 line 35-39, calling party number

and called party number (claimed “the data”) are indications of the event (calling by or being called).

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Bjornberg et al in view of Lew et al to have “the data includes indications of selected events represented by the selected records” as taught by Lew et al such that the modified system of Bjornberg et al in view of Lew et al would be able to support the system users with ease of knowing event indication.

3. Claims 44, 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjornberg et al, and in view of Lew et al.

The modified system of Bjornberg et al in view of Lew et al as stated in claim 43 above failed to teach “the communication includes an information assistance call”. However, The type of call received by the IVR as taught by Bjornberg et al is a “Decide Choice”.

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Bjornberg et al in view of Lew et al to have the “information assistance call” such that the modified system of Bjornberg et al in view of Lew et al would be able to support the system users with the particular type of call – information assistance call.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2645

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to Central FAX Number 703-872-9306.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow

(W)



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600